

<p style="text-align: center;">Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</p>	Application No. 10/591,779 Examiner /Peter A. Hruskoci/	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="padding: 5px;">Applicant(s) WHITTAKER ET AL</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 60%; padding: 5px;">Art Unit 1797</td> <td style="width: 40%;"></td> </tr> </table>	Applicant(s) WHITTAKER ET AL		Art Unit 1797	
Applicant(s) WHITTAKER ET AL						
Art Unit 1797						

All Participants:

(1) /Peter A. Hruskoci/

(2) Shiela A. Loggins

Date of Interview: 8 April 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Prior Art Rejections as stated in the prior Office action dated 12/2/09

Claims discussed:

All

Prior art documents discussed:

Prior Art of Record

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Amendments to the claims were suggested to patentably distinguish over the prior art of record in view of the test results shown in the instant Example. Shiela Loggins agreed to submit a supplemental amendment for formal consideration.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Peter A. Hruskoci/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)